EXHIBIT H

Pages 1 - 19

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Before The Honorable Charles R. Breyer, Judge

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

VS. NO. CR 24-00329 CRB

RUTHIA HE and DAVID BRODY,

Defendants.

San Francisco, California Thursday, December 12, 2024

TRANSCRIPT OF VIDEOCONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS

APPEARANCES: (via videoconference)

For Plaintiff: ISMAIL J. RAMSEY

United States Attorney 450 Golden Gate Avenue

San Francisco, California 94102

BY: KRISTINA GREEN

JACOB FOSTER EMILY GURKIS

ASSISTANT UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

For Defendant Ruthia He:

WILLKIE FARR & GALLAGHER, LLP

2029 Century Park East

Los Angeles, California 90067

BY: KOREN BELL, ATTORNEY AT LAW

WILLKIE FARR & GALLAGHER, LLP

787 Seventh Avenue

New York, New York 10019

BY: MICHAEL SCHACHTER, ATTORNEY AT LAW

(APPEARANCES CONTINUED ON THE FOLLOWING PAGE)

Remotely Reported: Marla F. Knox, CSR No. 14421, RPR, CRR, RMR

U.S. District Court - Official Reporter

APPEARANCES: (via videoconference, continued)

For Defendant David Brody:

HICKEY & CHUNG, LLP Pier 9 - Suite 100 San Francisco, California 94111

BY: KOREN BELL, ATTORNEY AT LAW

TAMARA CREPET LAW
Pier 9 - Suite 100
San Francisco, California 94111
BY: TAMARA CREPET, ATTORNEY AT LAW

Thursday - December 12, 2024 1 10:31 a.m. 2 PROCEEDINGS ---000---3 Calling criminal action CR24-0329, USA THE CLERK: 4 5 versus Ruthia He and David Brody. 6 Counsel, please state your appearances. MR. FOSTER: Good morning, Your Honor, Jacob Foster 7 with Kristina Green and Emily Gurskis on behalf of the United 8 States. 9 THE COURT: Good morning. Good morning. Everybody 10 11 else is apparently muted. (Pause in proceedings.) 12 MS. CHUNG: Good morning, Your Honor, Naomi Chung and 13 Tamara Crepet on behalf of Dr. David Brody. 14 15 THE COURT: Good morning. 16 MS. BELL: Good morning, Your Honor, I will try again. 17 Can everyone hear me? 18 THE COURT: A little soft but if you speak up. MS. BELL: Okay. Good morning, everyone. I hope I 19 20 can be heard now. Koren Bell and Michael Schachter on behalf 21 of Ruthia He. THE COURT: Good morning. They are not on by video. 22 They are only on by phone; is that it? 23 Ms. He is in custody so --24 THE CLERK: THE COURT: Well, I know that. 25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And Mr. Brody, is he appearing by phone? THE CLERK: I was unable to reach Dr. Brody. MS. CHUNG: Sorry. I know he has some health issues that apply in the morning, so I wasn't able to reach him this morning in time to appear for court. THE COURT: Okay, but I assume we can proceed without the presence of the Defendants; is that correct? That's correct, Your Honor. MS. CHUNG: THE COURT: And on behalf of Ruthia He. Yes, Your Honor. Thank you very much for MS. BELL: accommodating us on an emergency basis. Sure. As I understand it, the reason for THE COURT: this conference is to address the issues of production of the documents in a form that is accessible to the Defendant while incarcerated at Santa Rita. That's basically the issue. And I further understand that according to what I have read, is that this issue arises in the context of several matters. First of all, that the volume of documents, which is admittedly massive involving millions of documents, presents one issue. That is, that there are all of these documents. Secondly, that they have not been produced or -- well, I don't know whether they have or not -- but they are in a form that is not useful to the Defendant. The question is: Have

they been produced -- my understanding is that at least some

have been produced in -- in a form, quote, Relativity or something like that. Some have been produced in a PDF that -- that what would be useful to the Defendant is if they are all produced in a PDF, something along that line.

So, that's what I understand the issue to be. Is there -is that correct or is there -- in addition is there something
else that we want to discuss?

MS. BELL: Thank you, Your Honor. Yes, there is a threshold issue, which is what presents, I think, the urgent -- the even more urgent nature of our request for Court intervention, which is that even if the Government were to undertake this resource, an extremely time intensive process of converting the record that it has produced to date to a searchable PDF form, which would allow them to be opened on the court issued tablet, that, it turns out, does not really provide our client with meaningful access to the documents in light of the sheer volume of the documents and the fact that the court ordered tablet does not have a search function that will allow her to search across the millions of pages.

And so, in other words, after what the Government estimates to be a six to eight-week process of converting just the impacted documents from production 1 -- and we now have eight additional government productions plus a whole set of filtered team materials -- so, it would be by their estimation six to eight weeks to do the reformatting of just a small

subset of the impacted materials, the problem is that our client would not be able to meaningfully review them on the court issued tablet because of the lack of the search function. So, she would effectively have to open each individual file. Once opened a PDF, she can search within the PDF if the Government converts to that format; but she can't just search across them the way we would on the Relativity platform.

And that is what led us to inquire whether there would be an option for her to access the Relativity site from within the jail because that would obviate the need to convert any files, and it would also solve the problem of her meaningful access because it would allow her to search across documents.

And so, given our conversations at last week's status conference and the Court's indication that the parties were to come to a resolution on this issue by yesterday, we wanted to bring the issue to the Court's attention immediately because even if we go down this path, which doesn't work from a timing perspective, it is not going to solve really the access problem from our perspective.

THE COURT: Okay. And as I understand the issue of a searchability, which is really the one you were addressing, in the context of millions of documents, the problem with searchability is that it would require internet access; is that right?

MS. BELL: Yes, Your Honor. In order to -- the tablet

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

does have the function that it can be set to access just the Relativity internet site. So, that can be done from a technical perspective; but from the jail's perspective -- and both the Defense and the Government have spent quite a bit of time inquiring into whether that would be a possibility from the jail's perspective -- and they have said definitively no; that that would not be permissible. That would be the most direct and streamlined response to this problem were that to be a possibility because it is something that could be put into place very quickly, and then it would allow our client to have real-time access to what we, as her counsel, concurrently access, which is productions, you know, 1 through 8. We are still loading production number 9. THE COURT: Let me --But that doesn't seem to be an option. MS. BELL: THE COURT: Let me explore that option a little bit more. My understanding -- when you say that the -- the facility has an issue with that, as I understand it, it's that what? it they don't have -- either the ability or the -- or the process for allowing inmates to have internet access; is that the issue? In other words, are you saying to me, well, if -- here is our solution, but is it -- does it look like -- you say, "Here

is our solution. Give her access to the internet." And then

they -- the facility comes back and says, "There is no access to the internet here for inmates."

And so, the answer then is: Well, she will have to go somewhere where there is access to the internet. And that's at least a part -- I mean, there is more to discuss in that regard; but just in terms of mechanics, is that what the issue is?

MS. BELL: Yes, Your Honor. That's what I understand it to be; that the jail says that inmates cannot access the internet even if it's set to only the Relativity site.

THE COURT: All right. So, let me ask -- let me turn to the Government. What -- what are your thoughts in that regard?

MR. FOSTER: Yes, Your Honor. So, the Government has tried to go beyond its discovery obligations. We filed a response to their motion noting we have done a number of things. We have produced a subset of hot documents that are viewable on the iPad. We have also produced documents in what is called text format, which is loadable onto the iPad; so, these e-mail and Slack productions the Defendant can reach -- I'm not a technology expert -- but I believe they would also be able to search.

And so the request that every document, every scrap of data in this case needs to be converted to a chosen format is without supporting law and it's unreasonable.

I will turn it over to AUSA Green to address the Santa Rita issue.

MS. GREEN: Yes, Your Honor. With respect to the internet issue that you have flagged, that what Ms. Bell said is accurate. So, there is no place in the jail where the inmates have access to the internet.

But to Mr. Foster's point, we do understand that the bulk of Defendant's concern here is the e-mail and the Slack productions, which as Mr. Foster said, have been produced in text file format which can be loaded to the iPad; and she can search within those. So, in terms of access to those documents, she has them in text format. And, you know, we believe that we have complied with our discovery obligations. The fact that she might prefer them in PDF format versus text file format we don't think is relevant here.

THE COURT: Well --

MS. BELL: Your Honor, I will --

THE COURT: Go ahead.

MS. BELL: My apologies.

THE COURT: Go ahead.

MS. BELL: I will just say that seems to be a point of material disagreement. I'm certainly not a tech expert either, but based on our extensive communications, both with the Government and with our tech experts, I think we have run to ground the issue that our client does not have physical access

to these files in any way that they can be opened on the 1 So, we believe that is a --2 tablet. THE COURT: Well, I thought you're using this company 3 Relativity; is that correct? 4 5 MS. BELL: Yes, Your Honor, correct. THE COURT: Okay. So, they do have the ability -- at 6 least I thought they did -- of converting them to PDF form by 7 simply pushing a button. 8 MS. BELL: So, Your Honor, yes, the files can be 9 converted. It's the time and cost to --10 11 THE COURT: And I understand that's not the only thing that you are saying. You are saying they can be converted, but 12 you are saying to be useful they have to be searchable? 13 MS. BELL: Yes, Your Honor. They have to be 14 15 searchable across files not just within files given that we are 16 talking about approximately 5 million pages of --17 THE COURT: Documents. MS. BELL: -- material. 18 THE COURT: All right. So, why isn't the thing for me 19 to do -- first of all, is to continue with the efforts of 20 production; produce it in whatever is being done, produce it 21 in -- in a form that Relativity can convert it to PDF; and I 22 23 will have -- I have before me now the bill of particulars -the motion on the bill of particulars, and it strikes me 24 that -- that while I don't have the opposition to it yet, I 25

expect to get it, I guess this week. Is that when I'm getting it?

MR. FOSTER: The 16th, Your Honor.

THE COURT: The 16th, whenever that is. That I will then be able to focus on that. In the event I grant it, then while we are talking about 5 billion pieces of paper, you know, practically speaking, if, in fact, the bill of particulars addresses, you know, 10 -- 10 incidents or 20 or 30, you are really talking about the paper or the documents related to those 30.

Now, I grant you that there may be other documents that you want access to and that you may deem to be relevant; but then, number one, you will have access to it. In terms of -- in terms of its relevance if necessary, we can re-visit it once I decide the bill of particulars motion.

I'm just trying to break this down into steps because there is no answer -- I mean, there is the answer. I mean, the answer is, I suppose, is having the Defendant come to a secured facility on a daily basis and going through hundreds and thousands and millions of documents every day, five days a week, all day. And that -- that while a person has that right, I can't believe that anybody in their right mind wants that to occur. It is totally unnecessary.

So, I think that the next step for me is to see if it is appropriate to break this down in terms of a bill of

particulars. And then when you look at what are the -- the ABCs of it or the 123s of it, the Government will be in a very good position to say, "Here are the 1,000 documents or 500 or 20 related to the 10, 20, 30 particulars and here they are. They are in a usable form. And if you need access to further -- I mean, meaningful or a -- if you need other documents, you have them but let's discuss it. Maybe we can -- maybe we can accommodate your -- your requirement."

And, I mean, I'm not sure that the Government has to agree or not agree or even be advised as to that. So, we avoid that; but I may, you know -- I would, of course, allow -- I would, of course, allow the Defense to -- to approach the Court in an exparte proceeding relating to its defense.

So, what I'm saying is, like, today is whatever it is. I don't know that we are quite in the position of making the decisions of how to deal with the policies of, like, Santa Rita and this Court and the CJA funds and who is paying what and what are we looking at and I'm -- by the way, I'm not faulting the Defense for -- the Defense is bringing this because I asked them to.

So, I'm not faulting a party. I'm just trying to figure out am I in a position to help move this thing along. My answer is not today. My answer is: Let me take a look at the scope of the case, what has to be proved and what doesn't, what's in and what's out -- in a global sense or maybe even in

a specific sense for some of these things -- and then -- and then I can make some decisions. We all make decisions. You know, and that's where I think we go from here.

So, unless somebody wants to add something to it, I think
I understand the basic arguments; but I need to have some
further arguments once I make a determination as to the bill of
particulars.

MS. BELL: Your Honor, if I may, yes, we agree that the bill of particulars is implicated by the sheer volume of discovery here and that it would assist us as counsel in narrowing and focusing our work and in potentially helping to direct our clients, but it doesn't obviate the issue that we are bringing to the Court's attention; and I don't think that waiting until the bill of particulars is resolved is going to advance the problems teed up here insofar as any type of file conversion is a very time-consuming process, as the Government has laid out, regardless of who does it.

And so, our client's position is that she would like the ability -- we are talking about her own e-mails. So, even if the Court grants the bill of particulars, given the Government's theory here -- that she caused unlawful prescriptions through policies at her company -- that -- those particulars potentially implicate a broad swath of her communications and the other communications at issue.

THE COURT: Okay. Let me ask: Are her e-mails -- in

what form are her e-mails presently?

MS. BELL: They are currently in a form that is not supported by the tablet. So, this is addressed in footnote 3, but the e-mails and Slacks were provided in formats such as EML, e-mail or MSG, as I understand it. And all of her text, app and messaging data were produced as files within Axiom or Cellebrite. While we as her, Counsel --

THE COURT: Can -- go ahead.

MS. BELL: We, as her, Counsel, can access those on the Relativity site.

THE COURT: Right.

MS. BELL: But she cannot access those on her tablet and even if we were --

THE COURT: Well, then advise the Court. Talk to your computer people, the Relativity people, and ask them what would be involved in converting those e-mails to -- to, what's it called, to PDF form. Ask them -- what it would take in terms of time and effort to convert those to PDF.

MS. BELL: And, Your Honor, that is what both parties have done. The Government's estimate was six to eight weeks just for --

THE COURT: Well, I'm not asking what it would take them. I'm asking you what would your provider take because I have been told that they can do this very quickly by people who are computer experts. So, I'm getting -- you know, the

Government is the Government. I'm not going to get into -- I'm not running the Government today -- good God. I mean, please, don't even suggest such a thing -- but you do have -- you do have a company that's assisting you, and my question to you is what -- what does the company say would take them in terms of time in order to --

MS. BELL: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: -- convert a very narrow group. And when I say "very narrow," I mean, she may have 50,000 e-mails. I'm not suggesting they are ten. What would it take to convert her e-mails to PDF.

MS. BELL: So, Your Honor, there are 5 million
e-mails, Slacks and text and app messaging data. There are
15 million total documents. So, the particulars help with the
15 million universe. They do not help from our client's
perspective for the 5 million plus that relate to her
communications.

From what we know from our vendor thus far, it's going to be a multi-week process for us too. It is not a click of the button given the volume that we are dealing with. And,

Your Honor, a big source of concern here is these productions are forthcoming. The Government has indicated we are getting another one next week, production 10. This last week we have gotten over a million pages. The vast majority of those are e-mails and Slacks. There is no end in sight to this.

The Government has already indicated that there are still outstanding large -- potentially large productions of grand jury material that may implicate the same exact formatting problem and --

THE COURT: All right. Well, wait. Time out. Time out.

MS. BELL: Yes.

MR. FOSTER: Your Honor --

THE COURT: All right. Fine, okay. Yes, Mr. Foster.

MR. FOSTER: Thank you. One thing I would note there is that the documents that Counsel talks about are documents produced by the Defendant's own company that have been given to the Government since these last status hearings.

The Government has no -- cannot predict the future of what Defendant's company gives us. And when they give it to us, we give it directly to the Defendant. One other interesting thing to note is that Defendant's company recently, without discussing with the Government, started producing in PDF, her chosen format. Defendant's company is still making millions of dollars a month. These are not CJA lawyers. The Government has been reasonable in saying, "We are happy to divide and conquer this problem. Even if it isn't our obligation under Rule 16, maybe we will convert some into PDF. You convert others. Maybe there's some things that don't need to be converted at all because, you know, things on people's phone

like calendar announcements, probably not relevant to the case." And so, we are happy to work with the Defense on these issues.

THE COURT: Well, continue to work. Hopefully there will be in the form of PDF. I will address the subject again after I address the bill of particulars. That's -- I mean, I have got to move forward on this, and I have to have a way to move forward on it; and that's the way I have chosen to move forward on it because, again, it's been my experience after 25 years that all cases, no matter how complicated they are, have a -- have a -- rely on a totally manageable number of documents, notwithstanding the millions of documents that have been created, they -- the case itself is based on a manageable number.

Now, it may be when the day is over, after we figure out what's allowed and what isn't allowed or what the particulars are and so forth, it may be the case is unmanageable. And then maybe I have to sever counts or maybe do something else. I don't know but I'm not there yet. I'm not going to say this case is unmanageable, and I'm not going to say that 5 million, 10 million, 20 million documents have to be now reduced to a -- to a searchable format because, by the way, number one, I don't know what that would cost; and, number two, I don't know how many months that would take. You know?

MS. BELL: Your Honor --

THE COURT: Yeah.

MS. BELL: If I may, Your Honor -- and thank you. We appreciate that. I would say for Ms. He even though the Court thinks it may sound crazy, I'm confident that if given the opportunity to be transported to a location while this bill of particulars issue is pending to begin the review of these materials, she would accept that gratefully and very much would like to have access to the materials.

THE COURT: I'm not doing that. I'm not doing that.

Look, she has created this situation. She created the custodial situation. That -- that is entirely her action. The Government did not. She did. And so one of the consequences of doing it is that it makes it more difficult for her to -- to allocate her time and go through documents and so forth in the -- in a way of her choosing.

Now, after having said that, it's also clear she can't be prejudiced. Prejudiced to the sense that it somehow denies her the ability to effectively represent herself -- or be represented, and I'm mindful of that as well. And that's why I want to work through it.

I understand your request. I understand that you object to the way I am going forward on this, but I am going forward on this the way I said I'm going to go forward on this; and we will take a look at it. I would -- I would encourage the parties to continue the process of producing documents on a PDF

```
All right. Thank you very much. Appreciate it.
 1
     basis.
              MS. BELL: Thank you, Your Honor. We appreciate your
 2
 3
     time.
 4
              THE COURT: Bye-bye.
              THE CLERK: That concludes this morning's proceedings.
 5
     Thank you.
 6
 7
                   (Proceedings adjourned at 10:58 a.m.)
                                 ---000---
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter. DATE: December 13, 2024 Marla Krox Marla F. Knox, CSR No. 14421, RPR, CRR, RMR United States District Court - Official Reporter